

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/038,263	10/24/2001	Tom C. Xu	6959		
7590 12/01/2003			EXAMINER		
Tom C. Xu			SNAY, JEFFREY R		
21010 Sherman Drive Castra Valley, CA 94552			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1743		
			DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/038,26	3	XU, TOM C.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		Jeffrey R.	Snay	1743			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	12 September 2	<u>, 003</u> .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is no	n-final.				
3)□	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)🖂)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15-26</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15-26</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election re	equirement.				
Application Papers							
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
12)							
Attachment							
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No			(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)			

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry in view of Pugh.

Curry discloses an optical sensing device which comprises an optical fiber, a reagent matrix attached to one end of the fiber, and a light source and detector communicating with the opposite end of the fiber. The device of Curry differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to specify a housing for engaging the opposite end of the optical fiber with the light source and detector.

However, Pugh disclose a similar hand-held optical sensor which includes a housing for containing the optoelectronics and for communicating the optoelectronics with the reagent matrix. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the device of Curry with a housing in order to contain and communicate the necessary optoelectronics, as per the teaching of Pugh.

Regarding instant claims 16 and 22, see Curry at column 2, line 38, teaching the device to be disposable. Regarding instant claims 17, 18, 23 and 25, see Curry at column 5, lines 29-43. Regarding instant claims 19 and 24, see Pugh at column 5, first

Art Unit: 1743

paragraph, teaching the alternative means for attaching the reagent matrix using an adhesive. Regarding the presently recited dimensions for the optical fiber, see Curry at column 5, first full paragraph, teaching a fiber diameter of 0.23 mm, which diameter falls within the presently recited range. Regarding the presently recited length, see Curry at column 5, lines 59-63 teaching that the length is selected so as to provide the desired optical path between light source, reagent and detector. Furthermore, Pugh teaches the housing to mimic a pen in order to facilitate holding during use. Thus it is evident that the optical fiber length in the modified device of Curry would have fallen within applicant's presently claimed range. In any event, modification of size of a known device cannot impart patentability.

The examiner acknowledges applicant's request for assistance in drafting a patentable claim. Regrettably, no patentable subject matter has been identified around which a technically adequate claim could be drafted.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1743

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Page 4

Response to Arguments

- 5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Snay whose telephone number is (703) 308-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Jeffrey R. Snay Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743